

**Vice-Chair**  
Ochoa Bogh, Rosilicie

**Members**  
Cabaldon, Christopher  
Choi, Steven S.  
Cortese, Dave  
Gonzalez, Lena A.  
Reyes, Eloise Gómez

# California State Senate

## EDUCATION



**SASHA RENÉE PÉREZ**  
CHAIR

**Staff Director**  
Olgallia Ramirez

**Principal Consultant**  
Ian Johnson  
Michelle Nguyen

**Consultant**  
Therresa Austin

**Committee Assistant**  
Maria Velez  
Irma Kam

1021 O Street, Room 6740  
(916) 651-4105  
FAX: (916) 324-0917

## AGENDA

Wednesday, March 25, 2026  
9 a.m. -- 1021 O Street, Room 2100

### MEASURES HEARD IN FILE ORDER

- |     |         |          |   |
|-----|---------|----------|---|
| *1. | SB 959  | Grayson  | Average daily attendance: emergencies: major safety hazard.(Urgency)  |
| 2.  | SB 1006 | Padilla  | Student financial aid: Cal Grant B access costs award.  |
| 3.  | SB 1058 | McNerney | School districts: contracting: purchases for child nutrition programs.  |
| 4.  | SB 1140 | Ashby    | Pupil safety: limiting school access to unauthorized individuals.   |
| 5.  | SB 1141 | Wahab    | Public contracts: University of California Senior Management Group employees: conflicts of interest: prohibition. |

**\*Consent Items**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** SB 959 **Hearing Date:** March 25, 2026  
**Author:** Grayson  
**Version:** March 9, 2026  
**Urgency:** Yes **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** Ian Johnson

**Subject:** Average daily attendance: emergencies: major safety hazard.

## SUMMARY

This bill, an urgency measure, authorizes a local fire agency to determine the imminence of a major safety hazard for purposes of holding a local educational agency's (LEA's) average daily attendance (ADA) harmless for state funding purposes.

## BACKGROUND

Existing Law:

- 1) Establishes that LEAs are funded based on ADA and defines "material decrease" as a drop of at least 10% in attendance due to qualifying emergencies. (Education Code (EC) § 46392; California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 5 § 428)
- 2) Lists qualifying emergencies for ADA credit, including fire, flood, epidemic, earthquake, impassable roads, and other extraordinary conditions, including civil or military orders. (EC § 46392)
- 3) Allows LEAs to submit a Form J-13A to the California Department of Education (CDE) to request ADA and instructional time credit during an emergency or material attendance loss.
- 4) Requires LEAs to offer independent study during emergency closures or attendance disruptions to retain ADA credit, and includes audit requirements for substantiating compliance. (EC §§ 42238.023, 51745, 51747, 51749.6)
- 5) Requires future inclusion of instructional continuity plans in school safety plans, effective July 1, 2026. (SB 153 Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 38, Statutes of 2024; AB 176 Committee on Budget, Chapter 998, Statutes of 2024)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes a local fire agency to determine the imminence of a major safety hazard for purposes of holding an LEA's ADA harmless for state funding purposes.
- 2) Is an urgency statute which would go into effect immediately.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, "California has experienced an unprecedented rise in the frequency and severity of wildfires as the state faces the new reality of a year-round fire season. Recent tragedies like the Eaton and Palisades Fires in Southern California along with the Dixie and LNU Lightning Complex Fires in Northern California have led to action on several fronts to apply lessons learned from these tragic events.

In response to recent devastating wildfires, the Legislature has acted to both rebuild affected communities and bolster mitigation efforts to lower future fire risk. However, more must be done to ensure that communities have every tool available to them to respond to fire danger appropriately.

One area where there remains a gap in current law is in the Education Code section that governs the type of emergency situations that a school may cancel classes and not lose out on ADA funding.

This update to the law will assure that school districts will not lose ADA funding if they err on the side of student and community safety in the face of an imminent wildfire. Including fire agencies in this vital decision-making process has the potential to save the lives of students, teachers, and school personnel by keeping them out of harm's way when their campuses are threatened by potential wildfires."

- 2) ***Education law protects districts from losses in ADA due to emergency situations.*** Two sections of the EC empower the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to grant regular apportionment credit to districts during emergencies. Under EC Section 41422, districts can maintain apportionments when schools close due to "extraordinary conditions." When the SPI approves credit for closed school days, districts receive ADA credit and instructional time credit for the time lost during the closure, satisfying state law requirements for both the minimum 175-day year and longer day and year standards.

EC Section 46392 allows for ADA credit whenever the ADA of educational institutions decreases significantly due to various emergencies, including fires, floods, and impassable roads. Despite differences in wording between the two sections, their purpose remains the same: to protect school districts and county offices from revenue loss resulting from reduced ADA or instructional time during emergencies.

- 3) ***Disaster preparedness in schools.*** Under existing law, CDE is required to electronically distribute disaster preparedness educational materials and lesson plans that are currently available to school districts and county offices of

education. The CDE must (1) ensure that the disaster preparedness materials are available in at least the three most dominant primary languages spoken by English learners in California, and (2) coordinate with the Office of Emergency Services to make sure that all materials are reviewed and updated annually. Among the materials circulated to LEAs are information about teaching children proper use of 9-1-1, fire safety information, emergency preparedness, and curriculum-based programs on the emotional, social, and economic effects of natural and human-caused disasters.

Further, each school district and county office of education is responsible for the overall development of all comprehensive school safety plans for its schools operating kindergarten or any of grades 1 through 12. Charter schools must include in their petitions the procedures that the charter school will follow to ensure the health and safety of pupils and staff.

- 4) ***State response to recent wildfire impacts on schools.*** California has repeatedly taken action to support schools affected by major wildfires, most recently in response to the January 2025 Los Angeles County wildfires. At that time, the Governor issued Executive Order N-6-25 declaring a state of emergency and providing statutory flexibility for impacted LEAs, including relief from certain Form J-13A affidavit requirements for school closure requests, flexibility related to instructional day and minute requirements, suspension of certain class size requirements, temporary suspension of residency requirements for displaced students, and encouragement for LEAs and bargaining units to adjust staffing ratios to accommodate displaced pupils.

The 2025-26 State Budget further provided targeted fiscal protections and resources, including protections for attendance-based funding in the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program, protection of Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) funding for affected charter schools, redirection of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support savings to support fire-impacted LEAs, enrollment hold-harmless provisions for the Student Support and Professional Development Discretionary Block Grant, \$9.7 million to backfill property tax losses for basic aid districts, and a rebenchmarking of the Proposition 98 minimum guarantee to accommodate that backfill, as well as extensions of certain executive order flexibilities.

The Governor's proposed 2026-27 budget continues this recovery effort by proposing \$22.9 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund to support LEAs continuing to recover from the 2025 Los Angeles County wildfires, including \$4 million for Pasadena Unified School District.

- 5) ***Allowing local fire agencies to determine the imminence of a major safety hazard.*** Current law allows schools to cancel classes without financial penalty when there is an "imminence of a major safety hazard" as determined by a local law enforcement agency. However, in situations involving wildfire risk, local fire agencies are often the entities best positioned to assess conditions on the ground and determine whether a campus faces imminent danger. School administrators, law enforcement officials, and fire authorities have indicated that the existing statute does not clearly authorize fire agencies to make this

determination, which may create uncertainty for districts seeking to close schools proactively out of an abundance of caution.

Given the increasing frequency and severity of wildfires across California and the growing number of schools located in or near Fire Hazard Severity Zones, this bill seeks to align the statute with the practical realities of emergency response by allowing local fire agencies, who possess specialized expertise in wildfire behavior and risk assessment, to determine when an imminent safety hazard exists. Allowing these agencies to make such determinations may help ensure that schools can act quickly to protect students and staff without risking the loss of ADA funding.

**SUPPORT**

City of Lafayette  
City of Oakland  
City of Orinda  
Contra Costa County  
League of California Cities  
Town of Moraga

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	SB 1006	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	March 25, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	Padilla		
<b>Version:</b>	March 12, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Olgalilia Ramirez		

**Subject:** Student financial aid: Cal Grant B access costs award.

## SUMMARY

This bill, commencing with the 2027-28 award year, modifies the method for determining the Cal Grant B access award amount and providing for annual increases based on the California Consumer Price Index (CPI), as provided.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Cal Grant Program, administered by the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC), to provide grants to financially needy students to attend a college or university. The Cal Grant programs include both the entitlement and the competitive Cal Grant awards. The program consists of the Cal Grant A, Cal Grant B, and Cal Grant C programs, and eligibility is based upon financial need, grade point average (GPA), California residency, and other criteria. Maximum award amounts are adjusted in the annual Budget Act and have traditionally covered all systemwide tuition and fees. (Education Code (EC) § 69430 – 69433)
- 2) Under the Cal Grant Program, the Cal Grant B awards provide funds to eligible low-income high school graduates who have at least a 2.0 GPA on a four-point scale and apply either the year they graduate from high school or the following year. It also serves low-income community college students with a 2.0 community college GPA or a 2.4 GPA for community college transfer students. The award provides that the amount of the award for access costs cannot exceed \$1,551 (but provides for adjustment of this amount in the annual Budget Act) for books and living expenses for the first year and each year following for up to four years (or equivalent of four full-time years). After the first year, the award also provides tuition fee funding at qualifying postsecondary institutions. (EC § 69435, § 69435.5, and § 69436.)
- 3) Defines “access costs”, for purposes of the Cal Grant Program, as living expenses and expenses for transportation, supplies, and books. (EC § 69432.5)
- 4) Under the Cal Grant Program, establishes supplemental Cal Grant access award programs available to Cal Grant A, B, and C recipients with dependent child(ren) and former and current foster youth attending the California State University

(CSU), University of California (UC), or a California Community College (CCC) and qualifying private non-profit higher education institutions to assist (up to \$6,000) with non-tuition costs such as living expenses. This amount may be adjusted in the annual Budget Act. (EC § 69465 and § 69470)

## ANALYSIS

This bill, commencing with the 2027-28 award year, modifies the method for determining the Cal Grant B access award amount and provides for annual increases based on the CPI, as provided. Specifically, it:

- 1) Requires that the Cal Grant B access award be set at a minimum, at the maximum per-student level provided in the 2025-26 award year, instead of the \$1,551 capped amount established in statute. The ability for adjustments to be made through the annual Budget Act is retained.
- 2) Requires for the Cal Grant B access award including those for students with dependent children and current and former foster youth increase annually by the percentage increase, if any, in the CPI for All Urban Consumers as calculated and certificated by CSAC from data reported by the Department of Industrial Relations.
- 3) Requires that CSAC calculate and certify the percentage change using the data from the two most recent June indices, no later than January 15, 2027, for the 2027-28 academic year, and no later than September 1 of the year before each academic year thereafter. If the CPI decreases from the prior academic year, the award amounts are to remain at their most recently certified level.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “For more than 50 years, programs like California’s Cal Grant have opened the doors of higher education to millions of students. However, while tuition support has kept pace, with aid for basic living expenses has not. Today, the gap between what students receive and what it actually costs to afford housing, food, transportation, and books continues to grow, leaving too many students struggling to make ends meet. When financial aid fails to keep up with inflation and the real cost of attendance, students are forced to take on more debt, work longer hours, or reduce their course loads which delays graduation and undermines the promise of college affordability. Strengthening need-based aid and indexing it to rising costs serves as a commitment to ensuring that higher education remains truly accessible. This bill expands opportunity by not only investing in tuition, but in the full cost of college, so students can achieve better outcomes and futures.”
- 2) ***Recent efforts to address full cost of college.*** In 2019, a working group, comprised of higher education institutions, advocacy partners, students, and administrative and legislative staff convened by CSAC developed recommendations to reform the state’s Cal Grant Program to better support students cover college costs. In March 2020, they released their report, “*Cal Grant Modernization: A Vision for the Future*,” which highlights several issues

within the existing program. Among the issues raised is the lack of financial support provided for nontuition college expenses. The report notes that as currently structured, the Cal Grant Program is primarily based around helping students afford tuition but does little to address living costs. It calls on the state to do more to better address the total cost of attendance beyond just tuition and fees, especially considering that living expenses (e.g., housing, food, transportation, books and supplies, childcare, and health care) are outpacing tuition and fee increases. Following this and other work, several legislative efforts focused on assisting students in maximizing financial aid and covering living, food and housing expenses to support college attendance. These include, among many others, the following:

- a) *Cal Grant Reform* (untriggered). Enacted through the 2022 Budget Act, using the AB 1748 (Medina, 2022) provisions, a broader Cal Grant reform framework to simplify the program and expand access, including increasing and restructuring access awards to better reflect student living costs. Implementation was contingent on a Budget Act appropriation and has not been triggered, leaving the current structure in place.
  - b) *Targeted nontuition support*. The state has focused on targeted increases to access awards by enhancing awards for students with dependent children and foster youth to help cover living expenses.
- 3) ***Cal Grant B award***. There are three different types of Cal Grant —A, B, and C. A and B Cal Grants include both the entitlement and the competitive Cal Grant awards. The provisions in this bill apply to Cal Grant B awards and its associated supplemental access awards designated for students with dependent children as well as for former and current foster youth.

The Cal Grant B entitlement award serves eligible low-income high school graduates who have at least a 2.0 GPA. It provides an “access award,” for nontuition costs for living expenses such as food and housing. After the first year, the award also provides full tuition coverage for students enrolled at either CSU or UC and partial tuition coverage for students enrolled at private colleges and universities.

For community college students, Cal Grant B is generally used to support access costs, and may also cover tuition and fees where applicable, such as in upper-division courses in a CCC baccalaureate degree program. Eligible CCC students transferring to a qualifying four-year university may also receive an access award.

Students who do not qualify for an entitlement award can be considered for a limited number of Cal Grant B competitive awards. This bill would benefit all students receiving Cal Grant B awards.

- 4) ***Increase and adjusts the access award***. Statute sets a base access award amount capped at \$1,551, which may be adjusted through the annual Budget Act. For the 2025-26 academic year, the maximum annual Cal Grant B access award has been adjusted to \$1,648 for books and living expenses. A larger

award of up to \$6,000 is available for Cal Grant recipients with dependent children as well as for foster youth. The Institute for College Access and Success (TICAS), in their letter of support submitted to this committee, argues that the access award has retained only one-fifth of its original value and about half of its value since 2000-01 academic year. They also state that the standard non-tuition costs in California often exceed \$30,000 annually, before considering additional eligible expenses like childcare.

This bill seeks to provide for annual growth in access awards available to low-income students. The bill sets the minimum access award at the current funding level of \$1,648 and provides for annual increases based on inflation (CPI). The bill similarly provides for increases in the larger \$6,000 access awards for Cal Grant B recipients with dependent children and for foster youth. The bill retains existing language allowing amounts to be adjusted in the annual Budget Act. Staff notes that the Cal Grant reform framework also provides for a similar increase in access awards for CCC students to be adjusted based on the CPI.

5) **Prior and Related Legislation.**

AB 1364 (Ting, 2013) would have increased the maximum amount of the Cal Grant B access award to \$1,710, and similar to this bill would have provided for its annual adjustment upward (but prohibits its adjustment downward) based upon the CPI. AB 1364 died in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 1456 (Medina and McCarty, 2021) nearly identical to this bill, was vetoed by the Governor, enacted the Cal Grant Reform Act to be operative for financial aid awarded during the 2022-23 academic year. The act made vast reforms to the Cal Grant program, the state's largest post-secondary financial aid program. AB 1456 was vetoed by the Governor whose message read:

***“Expanding access to financial aid has been a priority for my Administration. During my first year as Governor, I worked with the Legislature to provide access awards of up to \$6,000 for students with dependent children. In partnership with the Legislature, we recently made historic investments in our financial aid system, including over \$235 million in ongoing resources to expand Cal Grant eligibility for community college students, and a combined \$632 million in ongoing resources to focus the Middle Class Scholarship Program on reducing students’ total cost of attendance. This bill seeks to replace those investments prior to their full implementation.*”**

***I agree with the author that making the Cal Grant program simpler to navigate would benefit our students and their families. However, this bill results in significant cost pressures to the state, likely in the hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Future changes to the financial aid system of this magnitude should be considered as a part of the annual budget process.”***

AB 1746 (Medina, 2022) would have made significant reforms to the Cal Grant Program, the state's largest post-secondary financial aid program, including phasing-out existing programs and the creation of the new Cal Grant 2 Program for CCC students and the Cal Grant 4 Program for students attending UC, CSU, and eligible private institutions. Provides that the award includes an access award, covering non-tuition expenses, of no less than the per-student amount provided in the 2020-21 award year in the first award year. Similar to this bill, in subsequent years, the award amount is adjusted based on the CPI, except under certain circumstances, as provided. The contents of the bill were subsequently amended into budget bill AB 183 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 54, Statutes of 2022).

AB 402 (Patel, 2025) sets, beginning with the 2026-27 award year, and subject to an appropriation for this purpose, the maximum tuition award amount for new Cal Grant A and B recipients attending an independent institution of higher education (ICCU) at either \$9,708 or \$8,056, with the higher amount conditioned on the achievement of the target numbers for associate degree for transfer commitments that apply for the prior award year. Authorizes a student who receives a CCC Expanded Entitlement Award and who subsequently transfers to an ICCU to remain eligible to receive the award, as specified. AB 402 is currently in this committee.

## **SUPPORT**

The Institute for College Access & Success (sponsor)  
California Competes: Higher Education for a Strong Economy  
Californians for College Affordability  
Campaign for College Opportunity  
Children Now  
EdTrust-West  
Go Public Schools  
John Burton Advocates for Youth  
National University  
Northern California College Promise Coalition  
Public Advocates  
University of California Student Association

## **OPPOSITION**

None received

-- END --

---

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	SB 1058	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	March 25, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	McNerney		
<b>Version:</b>	February 12, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	No
<b>Consultant:</b>	Michelle Nguyen		

**Subject:** School districts: contracting: purchases for child nutrition programs.

### SUMMARY

This bill makes clarifying changes to align statute—specifically relating to procurement bid solicitations and awards for school districts operating approved federal child nutrition programs—with federal procurement standards, which include removing a reference to price being the primary consideration for procurement bid solicitations and awards as well as correcting references to the Code of Federal Regulations.

### BACKGROUND

Existing federal law requires, as a condition of receipt of federal funds, that the recipient award contracts only to responsible contractors possessing the ability to perform successfully under the terms and conditions of a proposed contract. Consideration is to be given to such matters as contractor integrity, public policy compliance, past performance record, and financial and technical resources. Contracts are to be awarded to the responsible offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the recipient or subrecipient considering price and other factors. (Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 2, § 200.318 and 200.320)

Existing state law requires that procurement bid solicitations and awards made by a school district approved to operate at least one federal nonprofit child nutrition program for purchases in support of those programs shall (1) be consistent with specified federal procurement standard sections in the CFR; (2) that these awards shall be let to the most responsive and responsible party; and (3) that the price shall be the primary consideration, but not the only determining factor. (Public Contract Code (PCC) § 20111)

### ANALYSIS

This bill makes clarifying changes to align statute—specifically relating to procurement bid solicitations and awards for school districts operating approved federal child nutrition programs—with federal procurement standards, which include removing a reference to price being the primary consideration for procurement bid solicitations and awards as well as correcting references to the CFR.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, school nutrition directors “often use requests for proposals (RFPs) in their purchasing... This bill helps schools to better tailor their meal programs to the specific needs of their local communities by allowing them to consider factors beyond price when selecting vendors through the RFP process. ... Clarity is needed to ensure that they are able to obtain the highest quality locally sourced, minimally processed, most sustainable food and most culturally appropriate products for their students.”
- 2) ***Procurement types for school districts operating nutrition programs.*** Both federal regulations and California state laws require competitive procurements to be conducted in a manner that provides full and open competition. School food authorities (SFAs), which are governing boards of school districts that are authorized to operate federal child nutrition programs, must conduct either a formal or an informal procurement process. There are two primary formal competitive procurement methods: 1) RFPs and 2) Invitation for Bids (IFBs).

An RFP is a method of procurement in which SFAs publicly solicit (A) a technical proposal that explains how the prospective contractor will meet the objectives of the solicitation and (B) a cost proposal that identifies a price that could accomplish the technical proposal. The CFR states that these RFP contracts are to “be awarded to the responsible offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the recipient or subrecipient considering price and other factors.”

An IFB, also known as “sealed bids”, is a method of procurement in which SFAs publicly solicit sealed bids from an adequate number of known suppliers, with the goal of obtaining three bids at a minimum. An SFA must award the fixed-price contract to the lowest priced, most responsible bidder, whose bid is responsive, and conforms with all the material terms and conditions of the IFB. SFAs must allow bidders sufficient time to respond prior to the date set for opening the bids.

- 3) ***State’s recent approach has trended toward healthier, local food options.*** In recent years, California state government has taken action to encourage healthier food options and choices in schools, including encouraging school districts to procure and use fresh produce from local farms to prepare healthy and nutritious school meals for students. In addition, AB 1264 (Gabriel, 2025) reduces the consumption of ultraprocessed foods that are sold or served in schools by phasing these out over time. The state’s recent approach necessitates changes in what foods and supplies schools procure, which could lead to increased costs for healthier, local foods.
- 4) ***Proposed statutory changes intended to point at federal regulations.*** This bill includes two technical amendments that: (1) correct the specific federal regulations code sections cited in the PCC and (2) strike a phrase about selection criterion that only applies to one out of the two formal competitive procurement methods (specifically IFBs). These amendments are intended to point this specific provision in statute to federal procurement standards for school districts making purchases for federal nonprofit child nutrition programs.

SB 544 (McGuire, 2017) was the most recent legislation that amended the PCC code section being amended by SB 1058, and that bill required school districts operating child nutrition programs to award contracts for these programs with price being the primary, but not the only, selection criterion. Though the language for federal procurement standards on RFPs has been fairly consistent over the past ten years in requiring that RFP contracts must be awarded “while considering price and other factors”, the California Department of Education (CDE) indicated that the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) has shifted their guidance on RFP selection criteria in recent years. According to the CDE, when SB 544 was being heard in the Legislature in 2017, the USDA indicated in webinars and trainings that price was the primary, but not the only consideration, for awarding contracts using the RFP procurement method.

However, in 2022, the USDA published updated written guidance through a guide called “Procuring Local Foods for Child Nutrition Programs” that stated explicitly that an RFP “allows for consideration of factors other than price”, which is a change from SB 544. This 2022 guidance is also consistent with the CFR language on RFPs. SB 1058 proposes changes that point to the federal regulations, and if a scenario arises where the federal government shifts its guidance again, whether formally or informally, SB 1058’s proposed language is intended to be broad enough to accommodate those changes by simply pointing to the federal regulations.

#### 5) *Prior and Related Legislation.*

SB 544 (McGuire, Chapter 395, Statutes of 2017) required school districts operating federal child nutrition programs to award contracts for these programs consistent with federal procurement standards. This bill also required that these contracts be awarded to the most responsive and responsible party, and that price shall be the primary, but not the only, consideration when awarding contracts.

#### **SUPPORT**

California School Nutrition Association (sponsor)  
Alameda County Office of Education  
California Association of School Business Officials  
Los Angeles County Office of Education

#### **OPPOSITION**

None received

-- END --

---

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	SB 1140	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	March 25, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	Ashby		
<b>Version:</b>	February 18, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Therresa Austin		

**Subject:** Pupil safety: limiting school access to unauthorized individuals.

### SUMMARY

This bill adds to the required components of a Comprehensive School Safety Plan (CSSP) by requiring school districts, county offices of education (COE), and charter schools to include plans to exclude unauthorized individuals from school property during construction, facilities maintenance, and repair projects.

### BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Requires each school district or COE to be responsible for the overall development of all CSSPs for its schools operating kindergarten or any of grades 1 through 12. (Education Code (EC) § 32281)
- 2) Requires the schoolsite council or a school safety planning committee to be responsible for developing the CSSP in consultation with representatives from law enforcement agencies, fire departments, and other first responder entities, and requires that the CSSP be shared with law enforcement, the fire department, and other first responder entities. (EC § 32281)
- 3) Requires each school to adopt its school safety plan by March 1 and review and update its plan annually by March 1. Requires each school to annually report, in July, on the status of its school safety plan, including a description of key elements of the plan, in the annual school accountability report card (SARC). (EC § 32286)
- 4) Specifies that the CSSP must include:
  - a) An assessment of the current status of school crime committed on school campuses and at school-related functions;
  - b) Identification of appropriate strategies and programs to provide or maintain a high level of school safety;
  - c) Child abuse reporting procedures;
  - d) Disaster procedures, including adaptations for pupils with disabilities;

- e) An earthquake emergency procedure system;
- f) Accommodations related to relevant federal disability laws; a requirement that the annual evaluation of plans ensure appropriate adaptations; and allow parents and others to bring a concern about a student's safety to the principal;
- g) Policies regarding pupils who commit specified acts that would lead to suspension or expulsion;
- h) Procedures to notify teachers of dangerous pupils;
- i) A discrimination and harassment policy;
- j) Any schoolwide dress code;
- k) Procedures for safe ingress and egress of pupils, parents, and school employees to and from school;
- l) A safe and orderly environment conducive to learning;
- m) Rules and procedures on school discipline;
- n) Procedures for conducting tactical responses to criminal incidents, including procedures related to individuals with guns on school campuses and at school-related functions;
- o) Procedures to assess and respond to reports of any dangerous, violent, or unlawful activity that is being conducted or threatened to be conducted at the school, at an activity sponsored by the school, or on a school bus serving the school;
- p) Accommodations for students with special needs in case of emergency;
- q) Procedures related to severe fires, including a communication, refuge, and evacuation plan;
- r) Procedures to respond to incidents involving an individual experiencing a sudden cardiac arrest or a similar life-threatening medical emergency while on school grounds;
- s) A protocol for responding to a student suffering from an opioid overdose;
- t) An instructional continuity plan to establish communication with pupils and their families and provide instruction to pupils when in-person instruction is disrupted due to an emergency, including procedures for pupil engagement and a plan to provide access to in-person instruction or remote instruction, as soon as practicable; and

- u) Commencing with the 2026–27 fiscal year, a procedure to identify appropriate refuge shelter for all pupils and staff to be used in the event of an evacuation order in the event of a fire. Also requires each public school serving more than 50 pupils that is in a high or very high fire hazard severity zone to coordinate the procedure with the operational area having jurisdiction within the school’s boundaries. (EC § 32282)
- 5) Establishes the intent of the Legislature that each governing board of a school district formally address the problem of classroom interference and adopt a policy to control those interruptions, consistent with local circumstances and practices. (EC § 32212)
- 6) Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to develop and distribute to each governing board of a school district a model policy for the reduction and control of classroom interruptions, including but not limited to, intercom and public address system use. (EC § 32212)
- 7) Requires any person who is not a pupil of the public school, a parent or guardian of a pupil of the public school, or an officer or employee of the school district maintaining the public school, or who is not required by his or her employment to be in a public school building or on the grounds of the public school, and who has entered any public school building or the grounds of any public school, during school hours, and who is requested either by the principal of the public school or by the designee of the principal to leave a public school building or public school grounds to promptly depart from said school buildings or grounds and prohibits said person from returning for at least seven days. Specifies that a request that a person depart from a public school building or public school grounds shall be made by the principal, or the designee of the principal, exclusively on the basis that it appears reasonable to the principal, or the designee of the principal to conclude that the continued presence of the person requested to depart would be disruptive of, or would interfere with, classes or other activities of the public school program. (EC § 32211)
- 8) States that any person who fails to leave a public school building or public school grounds pursuant to the above request or returns within the seven days is guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished pursuant to Section 626.8 of the Penal Code. (EC § 32211)
- 9) States that any person who willfully disturbs any public school or any public school meeting is guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars. (EC § 32210)
- 10) Requires the governing board of a school district to post at every entrance to each school and grounds of a district a notice which shall set forth “school hours,” defined as the period commencing one hour before classes begin and one hour after classes end at any school, or as otherwise defined by the governing board of the school district. (EC § 32211)

**ANALYSIS**

This bill requires schools to add plans to exclude unauthorized individuals from school property by limiting points of access during construction, facilities maintenance, and repair projects, as part of the safe ingress and egress procedures of their CSSP.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “California schools work hard to keep their faculty and students safe, and fortunately, there is no known example of an active shooter breaching a locked door. However, unauthorized individuals have gained access to school campuses through open doors, propped-open gates, and other unsecured entry points. That is why we must ensure entry points are secure during construction, maintenance, and repair projects on school campuses.

SB 1140 addresses this issue by requiring schools to enhance their safety plans with measures that limit entry points and prevent unauthorized access during projects. This bill ensures California can continue to protect our students and schools from unauthorized individuals and dangerous events.”

- 2) ***Comprehensive School Safety Plans.*** School districts, COEs, and charter schools serving students in grades kindergarten through 12 are required to develop and maintain a CSSP designed to address campus risks, prepare for emergencies, and create a safe, secure learning environment for students and school personnel.

The law requires designated stakeholders to annually engage in a systematic planning process to develop strategies, policies, and procedures to prevent and respond to potential incidents involving emergencies, natural and other disasters, hate crimes, violence, active assailants/intruders, bullying and cyberbullying, discrimination, and harassment, child abuse and neglect, discipline, suspension and expulsion, and other safety aspects.

The law requires each school to update and adopt its CSSP by March 1 each year. Before a school district, COE, or charter school adopts its CSSP, the schoolsite council or school safety planning committee must hold a public meeting at the schoolsite to allow members of the public to express their opinions about the school safety plan. The schoolsite council or school safety planning committee must also notify the local mayor and representatives of the following:

- a) The local school employee organization.
- b) The parent organization at the school site, including the parent-teacher association and parent-teacher clubs.
- c) Each teacher organization at the school site.
- d) The student body government.

- e) All persons who have indicated they want to be notified.

Once the public meeting has been held and the CSSP is adopted, the school must submit its CSSP to its respective local educational agency (LEA) or COE for approval. LEAs and COEs must annually notify the California Department of Education (CDE) by October 15 of any schools that have not complied with requirements. Statutes also require the CDE to develop and post on its website best practices for reviewing and approving school safety plans.

- 3) ***Existing school authority to exclude unauthorized individuals.*** Schools have the authority to request the removal of unauthorized individuals who have entered any school buildings or grounds during school hours, if it appears that the continued presence of the unauthorized individual would be disruptive of, or would interfere with, classes or other activities of the school program. Such unauthorized individuals include any individual who is not among the following:
  - a) a pupil of the school;
  - b) a parent or guardian of a pupil of the school; or
  - c) an officer or employee of the school district maintaining the school who is required by their employment to be in a school building or its grounds

If a principal or their designee requests that an unauthorized individual leave the school or its grounds, the individual is prohibited from returning to campus for at least seven days. If said individual fails to leave and remains after being directed to leave, or returns within seven days after being directed to leave, they may be charged with a misdemeanor pursuant to Section 626.8 of the Penal Code.

- 4) ***Safe Ingress and Egress.*** This bill requires LEAs to include in their safe ingress and egress plans, plans intended to exclude unauthorized individuals from school property by limiting points of access during construction, facilities maintenance, and repair projects. This is in response to concerns voiced by educators, classified employees, and gun violence prevention organizations surrounding the vulnerabilities that may present themselves when school campuses undergo such projects. According to the California School Employees Association:

“Construction can make a hectic situation on a school site much more dangerous. Bad actors can take advantage of the vulnerabilities in security that construction and repair projects expose. There may be unfamiliar adults on campus, heavy equipment, and the general chaos that any disruption to routine can cause. It is important that our school staff are informed on how best to secure or even limit these entry points to keep students safe through a variety of circumstances.”

As part of a CSSP, schools are required to include procedures for the safe ingress and egress of students, parents/guardians, and school employees to and from a school site. In order to meet this requirement, the CDE’s [Compliance Tool for Comprehensive School Safety Plans](#) encourages schools to reference their campus visitor and registration policies as well as information on crossing guard

programs, safe routes to school, pedestrian, vehicle and bicycle policies, and traffic safety policies. For many schools, this component of their safety plan also includes information about official school hours of operation, gate locations and access hours, and other points of entry.

In other sections of the CSSP beyond safe ingress and egress, schools often include information on campus security responsibilities, as well as specific roles for administrators and staff in maintaining a secure campus. These may include monitoring responsibilities around campus perimeters, known trouble spots, and general building and gate entrances during the school day.

While existing law establishes baseline requirements for what *must* be included in the CSSP, schools are authorized to include additional provisions and components to further tailor plans to their campus and community. To this end, it is possible that schools may already have components of their CSSP that speak to these construction-related vulnerabilities—either explicitly or implicitly. This bill would require CSSPs to specifically develop plans to address them.

5) ***Prior and related legislation.***

AB 1721 (Muratsuchi, 2026) requires the SPI, in consultation with the State Board of Education (SBE), to convene a stakeholder workgroup on school safety by July 1, 2027, and for the workgroup to make recommendations on the development and approval process, as well as the required elements of a CSSP. *This bill is currently in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.*

AB 49 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 122, Statutes of 2025) prohibits school officials and employees of LEAs from allowing an officer or employee of an agency conducting immigration enforcement to enter a nonpublic area of a schoolsite for any purpose without being presented with a valid judicial warrant, judicial subpoena, or court order. Requires school officials or employees of a LEA, to the extent practicable, to request a valid identification from an officer or employee of an agency conducting immigration enforcement seeking to enter a nonpublic area of a schoolsite.

AB 1747 (Rodriguez, Chapter 806, Statutes of 2018) requires charter schools to develop a school safety plan, including procedures for conducting tactical responses to criminal incidents; requires CSSPs to include procedures for conducting tactical responses to criminal incidents; increases the CDE's responsibilities relating to school safety plans; and requires schoolsite councils to also consult with the fire department and other first responder entities in the writing and development of the comprehensive school safety plan.

## **SUPPORT**

CFT– A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO (sponsor)  
Brady United Against Gun Violence  
California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO  
California School Employees Association

Everytown for Gun Safety Action Fund  
Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America  
Students Demand Action for Gun Sense in America

**OPPOSITION**

None received

**-- END --**

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Sasha Renée Pérez, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

<b>Bill No:</b>	SB 1141	<b>Hearing Date:</b>	March 25, 2026
<b>Author:</b>	Wahab		
<b>Version:</b>	February 18, 2026		
<b>Urgency:</b>	No	<b>Fiscal:</b>	Yes
<b>Consultant:</b>	Olgalilia Ramirez		

**Subject:** Public contracts: University of California Senior Management Group employees: conflicts of interest: prohibition.

**NOTE:** This bill has been referred to the Committees on Education and *Judiciary*. A “do pass” motion should include referral to the *Committee on Judiciary*.

## SUMMARY

This bill prohibits a business from entering into a contract with the University of California (UC) if a UC employee in a senior management position serves or has served the business as specified within the previous year, or if the employee or their immediate family member has received compensation from the business within the previous year. The bill further authorizes a California taxpayer or Attorney General (AG) to bring a civil action to enforce the bill’s provisions and recover attorney’s fees if the civil action prevails.

## BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the UC as a public trust to be administered by the Regents of the UC; and, grants the Regents full powers of organization and government, subject only to such legislative control as may be necessary to insure security of its funds, compliance with the terms of its endowments, statutory requirements around competitive bidding and contracts, sales of property and the purchase of materials, goods and services. (Article IX, Section (9)(a) of the California Constitution)
- 2) Prohibits an officer or employee of the UC from engaging in any employment, activity, or enterprise from which the officer or employee receives compensation or has a financial interest if that employment, activity, or enterprise is sponsored or funded by a university department or contract, except as provided. It further prohibits an officer or employee from contracting on his or her own individual behalf as an independent contractor with any university department to provide services or goods. (Public Contract Code § 10516)

## ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits a business entity from bidding on, entering into, renewing, automatically renewing, extending, or expanding the scope of any contract with the UC Regents if a UC executive employee serves the business entity, or has served the business entity at any time within the previous 12 months, as a consultant, partner, director, governor, trustee, employee, manager, advisory board or member of any committee.
- 2) Prohibits a business entity from bidding on, entering into, renewing, automatically renewing, extending, or expanding the scope of any contract with the UC Regents for at least 12 months after providing or promising any UC executive employee, or the employee's immediate family member, compensation of any kind.
- 3) States that a contract entered into, renewed, automatically renewed, extended, expanded in scope, or maintained in violation of the bill's provisions be declared void, a risk to the security of the UC's funds, and contrary to public policy.
- 4) Authorizes civil action to enforce the bill's provisions to be brought by any California taxpayer or the AG, and upon prevailing, recover attorney's fees and costs. It further requires, if a court finds in such a civil action that a business entity has violated the bill's provisions, that the court enjoin the business entity from bidding on, entering, renewing, automatically renewing, extending, or expanding the scope of any contract with UC for 10 years from the date of the finding.
- 5) Defines all of the following terms for purposes of the bill:
  - a) "Business entity" to mean any private sector organization, regardless of its corporate form.
  - b) "Compensation" to mean a thing of value or source of income aggregating \$500 or more in value, and includes any cash, remuneration, loan, any type of ownership interest, return on investment, debt, lease, discount, retainer, fee, stipend, honoraria, equity, stock, stock option, dividend, distribution, subsidy, share of current or future profits, gift, donation, rebate, or kickback. "Compensation" does not include interest earned on personal savings or retirement funds or a loan provided by a financial or commercial lending institution in the regular course of business on terms available to the public without regard to the executive's official status.
  - c) "Contract" to mean any legally enforceable agreement that establishes the rights and obligations of two or more parties, one of which is the Regents of the UC, any UC campus, medical center, health system, hospital, clinic, laboratory, or facility or organization affiliated with the University, or any person acting on the University's behalf. "Contract" includes, but is not limited to, any agreement for the sale or lease of real property, the sale or lease of materials, and the provision of personal or professional services. "Contract" includes an evergreen contract, or an agreement that automatically renews from time to time.

- d) “Executive” or “University of California executive” to mean a UC employee who serves as or reports to a Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Chief Executive Officer, Chief Operating Officer, Chief Transformation Officer, Chief Human Resources Officer, or General Counsel of the University, or who holds any other position in the University’s Senior Management Group.
- e) “Twelve months” to mean any 12-month period starting on or after January 1, 2027.

## STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “State laws such as the Political Reform Act of 1974 and Government Code Section 1090 require most public officials to recuse themselves from contracting decisions in which they have a financial interest. These statutes do not address how many UC contracting decisions are made, however. Because UC’s contracting decisions take place behind closed doors and without a public vote, so recusal would not safeguard the public’s interest.

“In practice, UC’s decisions to enter into, renew or expand the scope of multi-million-dollar contracts are made by staff who report to UC Executives who may have a financial interest in the outcome of those decisions. Neither existing law nor UC policy prevents or addresses such conflicts of interest.”

The author further states, “the University of California system educates more than 300,000 students, employs 265,000 faculty and staff. It is the second largest employer in the State of California, and the second largest healthcare delivery system in California, only behind Kaiser. Given both its economic footprint and its vast purchasing power, it is vital that the State safeguards the investments and funds that the University manages and ensures that the UC lives up to the public benefit it provides. SB 1141 does that by stopping the private business seeking to contract with the University from providing financial rewards to University executives who oversee the University’s contracting decisions.”

- 2) ***Existing conflict-of-interest policies.*** Existing law primarily regulates conflicts of interest involving UC employees. This bill instead restricts the ability of private businesses to contract with UC when certain financial or service relationships including service on boards, advisory bodies, or in other formal roles exist with UC senior management employees. The UC indicates, in their letter submitted to this committee, that it is already subject to a comprehensive framework of state law and institutional policies governing conflicts of interest, including the Political Reform Act, Public Contract Code Section 10516, and a range of Regents policies and internal procedures. These policies require disclosure of financial interest, limit outside activities, and establish recusal requirements when conflicts arise. For example, UC policy requires employees, including senior management, to disclose financial interests and avoid participation in decisions where a conflict exists with recusal serving as the primary solution. *The committee may wish to consider how the restrictions proposed in this bill interact*

*with existing conflict of interest laws and UC policies, and whether those laws and policies already sufficiently address the concerns the bill seeks to remedy.*

- 3) **Covered employees.** The bill could apply broadly to many employees and by extension their immediate family members. UC indicates that there are approximately:
  - a) 505 employees who serve in, or report directly to, senior leadership positions.
  - b) 184 senior management group employees, many of whom are included in the broader group.

It's unclear to committee staff whether the scope of impacted employees aligns with the level of decision-making authority over contracting.
- 4) **Potential impact on UC.** This bill conditions vendor eligibility on financial relationships and relationships in the form of service involving UC senior management employees which may have potential implications for UC's operations. With respect to service relationships, UC employees frequently serve on advisory boards or in other outside roles due to their subject-matter expertise. It is unclear how the bill's provisions may have an impact on these types of routine activities, including unpaid advisory roles, and how such activities would be distinguished from relationships that present a direct conflict of interest. Implementation of the bill may require UC to develop additional disclosure and verification process related to the financial and service relationships of UC senior management employees and their family members to determine whether prospective vendors are eligible to contract with the UC. Also, to the extent vendors may face uncertainty regarding compliance with the bill's requirements, may impact vendor participation and the availability of certain goods and services including those supporting instruction, and operations.
- 5) **Definition of compensation.** The bill defines compensation to include money or anything of value of \$500 or more, including payments for services, fees, honoraria, or other financial benefits, and may include income generated from any type of ownership interests, such as dividends. The bill excludes interest earned on personal savings or retirement funds. However, it appears that the bill could apply to other forms of investment income or ownership interest. It's unclear whether the bill is intended to capture passive investments. *The committee may wish to consider whether the inclusion of passive investment income is necessary to achieve the bill's intent.*
- 6) **Arguments in support.** The sponsors of the bill, AFSCME 3299, in their letter of support state in part, "SB 1141, a long overdue step toward dismantling a dangerous practice of some companies that do business with UC and High-level UC executives. For years, we have witnessed troubling side-dealing relationships between companies who receive UC contracts and UC's senior management. We know of senior UC executives with 7-figure public salaries who have concurrent lucrative private roles with companies doing business with UC." They further contend that SB 1141 doesn't prevent a company from doing business at

UC nor does it prevent UC from selecting business executives to serve as a UC executive and that by prohibiting conflicts of interest, SB 1141 protects integrity in the UC's contracting process, maintains public trust, and shields state government from the damaging, scandal-baiting charges emanating from Washinton, DC.

- 7) ***Arguments in opposition.*** The UC argues in their letter of opposition, in part, "...SB 1141 bans contracting with any entity where a UC executive (or their direct report) serves on a board, advisory board, or committee. Unlike other conflict laws, this applies even to unpaid voluntary service – and provides for a 10-year contracting ban for any business entity found in violation of the new and expansive prohibitions. UC faculty and administrators are frequently sought for their expertise to serve on technical advisory boards. These roles ensure that UC's business partners develop tools that meet the needs of the UC community. Under SB 1141, a vendor would be barred from all UC business solely because a university expert provided expert guidance..." The University further argues, that "Maintaining the University's operations will become unfeasible if existing contracts are cancelled or vendors choose to avoid University contracts to avoid the risk of a 10 year, systemwide band from UC contracting. Existing laws already prevent UC employees from benefiting from university contracts. SB 1141 is an unnecessary measure that would cause the University's medical and instructional operations to grind to a halt."

## **SUPPORT**

AFSCME Local 3299 (sponsor)  
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO

## **OPPOSITION**

University of California

-- END --